In Kathy's file

Dear Dave,

9/25/96

Thanks for the Kathy Cunningham piece in the March Fourth Decade. I think it explains why I've not heard from her in so long, why she did not come with those she'd come with the year before when she was at COPA last year, why she did not send me what I'd asked for, not on this subject, and why she did not ask me to go over what she wrote before it was published.

It is fiction, conjecture, irrelevance and utter nonsense. And all that has substance and relates to what the writing is supposedly about was published in 1975 in Post Mortem. I should add ignorance becaude having helped herself to what was in Post Mortem and in presenting it as her own work she was ignorant of what is funadmental that is in Post Mortem.

I am not checking Humes' HSCA testimony. I have it on tape and paid close attention to it. He did testify that he destroyed those notes. Kathy's nonsense on that or any destruction not being unusual is answered in NEVER AGAIN! It is strictly forbidden.

Contrary to what Kathy writes, there is not only a record of the existence of those notes after the first days, it is a record that identifies where they then were, then being when Humes testified to the WC. They were allgedly in the exhibit that was to have been printed and in the CD I identified by number in Post Mortem, as Specter identified it when he questioned Humes.

When I sought them at the Archives the end of 1966 they were not there. It may have been earlier.

She makes reference to three facts in the proctocol not in any known record. This is, to use her title, her Gross Misunderstanding. The facts are in Post Mortem and it was enormously more than three facts that are in the proctocol and are not recorded in any known record. They come from those notes.

I've used a highlighter on what you sent and I'll take no more time for it now. I ask you not to spread this around because I do not want to get involved in any pointless controversy that can be avoided.

I'm surprised at how much is so very wrong in this one article.

This is inevitable when one begins with a theory and either ignores what is known and is relevant or is ignorant of it, as too few have learned after so many years. And all the time and effort that went into it!!!! More than wasted. Worse than.

Best,

Harold